536 ST. JOHN. VIL.   
   
 ach.i.4,5,9: VIII. 12 Then spake Jesus again unto them saying, \*I   
 19; ix.5: am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not   
 ii. 35, 46.   
 K render, Jesus therefore spake.   
   
 12— 59] THE CONFLICT BETWEEN as the Light. 12.] The attempts   
 JESUS AND THE JEWS, AT ITS HEIGHT. of Bengel, Stier, and others, to establish   
 12—20.] Testimony to Himself connexion with the passage concerning the   
   
   
 HISTORY OF THE WOMAN TAKEN IN ADULTERY.   
   
 down and taught them). 3 And the Scribes and Pharisees d brought   
 (dd unto him] a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her   
 a Lev. in the midst, 4 e¢hey say unto him, Master, this woman fwas taken in   
 Deut. xxii, adultery, in the very act. 54Now Moses in the law commanded us, that   
 R. read, bring. dd the most ancient MLS. omits this.   
 e the most ancient MS. reads, The priests say unto him, tempting him, that they   
 might have matter of accusation against him.   
 f render, hath been taken.   
 reader. $4 St. John never mentions,   
 “the Scribes” elsewhere, but usually calls answer need not have been so worded as   
 the opponents of Jesus “the Jews,” or “t: to trench upon this matter: and (c) the   
 rulers.” ‘ The Scribes and Pharisees” i accusers would have been more deeply   
 a very common expression in the three involved than Himself, if such had been   
 Gospels. The account gives no light as the case, being by the law the prominent   
 to the capacity in which these Scribes and persons in the execution. So that I   
 Pharisees acted when they brought the leave the difficulty unsolved. Liicke   
 woman. Probably, only as tempting Jesus, observes: ‘Since Jesus seems to avoid   
 and not in the course of any legal proceed- every kind of decision on the question put.   
 ings against her. Such would have re- to Hin, it follows that He found in it no   
 quired (Lev. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 22) that reference to the great subjects of His   
 the man also should have been put to teaching, but treated it as a purely civil   
 death. 4.] The words “say unto him, political matter, with which in His ministry   
 tempting him” savour much more of the He had no concern. Some kind of civil   
 three Gospels than of John: see Mt. xvi. political collision the question certainly   
 3 xix. 35 xxii, 18, 35: Mk. viii. 11; was calculated to provoke: but from the   
 x. 2; xii. 15, &e. Obviously our ch. vi. 6 brevity of the narration, and our want of   
 is no example to the contrary. The diffi- more accurate knowledge of criminal pro-   
 culty is even greater than the last, to say, ceedings at the time, it is impossible to   
 in what sense this was a temptation, to Jay down definitely, wherein the collision   
 lead to His accusation. The principal would have consisted.’ 5.] I will   
 solutions of it have been, (1) that the just remark that the very fact of their   
 command of the law had fallen into disuse questioning thus, ‘ Moses commanded, . . .   
 from the frequency of the crime, and to but what sayest Thou?’ belongs to the Jast   
 re-assert it would be contrary to the days of the Lord’s ministry, and cannot:   
 known mildness of Jesus. But what. well be introduced chronologically where   
 reason had any of His sayings,—who came it here stands: nor does St. John any where   
 to fulfil the Law, not to destroy it,—given introduce these questions between the   
 them to expect such mildness in this case ? law of Moses and Jesus; but the other   
 And suppose He had re-asserted the law,— Gospels often do. The command here   
 how could they have accused Him? (2) mentioned is not to be found, unless   
 That some political snare was hereby lai “putting to death’ generally, is be inter-   
 for Him, whereby the Roman power might preted as storing ;—compare Exod. xxxi.   
 have been brought to bear against Him. 14; xxxv. 2, with Num. xv. 35, 36, which   
 But this does not in any way appear ; for the special order given by God would sane-   
 (a) the Romans certainly allowed to the tion such a view. But the Rabbis taught   
 Jews (by connivance) the powcr of putting that every punishment of death in Scrip-   
 to death according to their law,—as they ture put absolutely, without specification,   
 did in the case of Stephen: (4) our Lord’s was to be understood as meaning stran-   
 gulation. The passage Ezck. xvi. 38, 40